TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE Transcriber's Office

February 24, 1999 LB 356

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, a motion on LB 356.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to bracket the bill until March 30, 1999.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Chair recognizes Senator Chambers, on his motion to bracket.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I thought Senator Byars wanted to get a vote on his bill, but he obviously doesn't, so I'm refiling all of my I'm going to carry on the discussion on this bill and all the other bills where I think it is essential. But there's one point that I want to make which I hadn't taken the time to make, and Senator Schellpeper did touch on it. I didn't think, Senator Schellpeper, it'd be necessary for us to deal with this aspect of it, and I've said this many times. The Legislature is becoming increasingly a group of busybodies. They want to dictate to adults how certain things ought to be done to meet with their approval, and that's what this bill is about. Senator Byars, there are other senators, whose name I will not (Laugh.) It's mighty tempting to do like Santa Claus, Senator Byars, and whistle and shout and call them all by name. But they will take this position that they know what is best. Well, race car drivers wear helmets. Why don't you make them wear helmets in their cars? These same people want to say they're acting in the interests of the public and representing the interests of the public. Well, the public voted to abolish the bill that required mandatory seat belts. The public spoke on it and the Legislature disregarded that. So the same people who want to talk about representing the interests of the people went against the people at that time, and I strongly opposed a bill that would make wearing seat belts mandatory in the first I've always opposed it. I oppose making it a primary offense to say that any young person who has any alcohol in his system while driving a car is guilty of a crime. I opposed it. There has to be a reason for the state to invoke its power against the citizens, and it should be more than the whim of an individual who thinks that he's going to save I think there are other issues that I've got to everybody. discuss in the context of this bill to show the support that